Case 5:23-cv-02245-RGK-BFM Filed 03/13/25 Page 1 of 4 Document 90 Page ID #:1361 CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT 03/13/2025 Jeff Macy "In Pro Per" CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA P.O. Box #103 Twin Peaks, CA 92391 EC Telephone: (909) 744 -8480 DOCUMENT SUBMITTED THROUGH THE Email: 1611Bible.us@gmail.com ELECTRONIC DOCUMENT SUBMISSION SYSTEM IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA JEFF MACY, as an individual, Case No.: 5:23-cv-02245-RGK-BFM PLAINTIFF, OBJECTION TO REPLY TO OPPOSITION VS. TO MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL, a State OF DEFENDANT OFFICER CHRISTOPHER Agency; Officer CHRISTOPHER BATES, in **BATES & SERGEANT JEFFREY O'BRIEN** his official capacity, Supervisor Officer Sergeant JEFFREY Ó'BRIEN, in his official Judge: Hon. Brianna Fuller Mircheff capacity, & DOES 1-10, inclusive, Trial Date: TBA DEFENDANTS. Action Filed: 5/06/2024 INTRODUCTION Plaintiff Jeff Macy objects to Defendant's reply to opposition to motion for summary judgment of Defendant Officer Christopher Bates & Sergeant Jeffrey O'Brien because the initial traffic stop was unlawful & only based on a suspicion of a seat belt violation. On October 23-24, 2023, Case #: 23IN-065744. Defendant

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

Plaintiff Jeff Macy objects to Defendant's reply to opposition to motion for summary judgment of Defendant Officer Christopher Bates & Sergeant Jeffrey O'Brien because the initial traffic stop was unlawful & only based on a suspicion of a seat belt violation. On October 23-24, 2023, Case #: 23IN-065744. Defendant Officer Bates admitted to being improperly trained. The judge asked if Plaintiff Jeff Macy wanted the win. Jeff Macy was proven innocent of the seat belt misdemeanor infraction traffic ticket; & \$153 money was returned in full. In Defendant's Reply to Opposition to Motion For Summary Judgment of Defendant Officer Christopher Bates & Sergeant Jeffrey O'Brien's introduction "2. Plaintiff refused to sign the traffic violation citation & request a supervisor" is a false statement. Defendant Christopher Bates DID NOT ask Plaintiff Jeff Macy to sign the traffic violation citation before Plaintiff requested a supervisor. Plaintiff saw Defendant Bates was fishing through his California Vehicle Code to try & find a violation. Plaintiff asked Officer Bates what CA Vehicle Code he violated

PAGE 1

10 11 12

9

14 15

13

16 17

18

19

20 21

23 24

22

25 26

27 28

& Defendant said it was §27315(e). CA Vehicle Code §27315(e) states "A person 16 years of age or over shall not be a passenger in a motor vehicle on a highway unless that person is properly restrained by a safety belt. This subdivision does not apply to a passenger in a sleeper berth, as defined in subdivision (x) of Section 1201 of Title 13 of the California Code of Regulations." Plaintiff Jeff Macy is a Bible Translator that follows the law, as soon as Christopher Bates requested Plaintiff Jeff Macy to sign the traffic violation citation, he did.

The first search by Officer Bates was unlawful, there was no consent given to Officer Bates as shown in the videos provided by both Plaintiff & Defendants. Defendant Officer Bates clearly conducted an unlawful search as admitted by Defendants that it was a search. Defendant Officer Bates did not have probable cause for the first illegal, unconstitutional search. Plaintiff was not given Defendant Officer Bates identification as requested several times by Plaintiff during the stop. Plaintiff had to go through much effort to obtain & identify Officer Bates. Plaintiff has demonstrated a genuine issue of material fact. Therefore, summary judgment in favor of Plaintiff Jeff Macy is warranted.

Both Plaintiff & Defendants Officer Bates & Sergeant Officer O'Brien factually acknowledge that the truck in the complaint is an Isuzu truck, yet according to Defendant's Reply to Opposition to Motion For Summary Judgment of Defendant Officer Christopher Bates & Sergeant Jeffrey O'Brien's "D. Plaintiff Requested That His Children Exit the Mazda, Not Defendants." Further proving that Defendants are not taking this serious & falsifying information.

Whether or not Plaintiff was required to pay a fine or convicted of the traffic violation does not refute the uncontroverted fact that Defendants did not have probable cause for both the stop & to conduct two short searches related to a potential seat belt violation.

Ca	se 5:23-cv-02245-RGK-BFM Document 90 Filed 03/13/25 Page 3 of 4 Page ID #:1363
1	Respectfully Submitted,
2	
3	By Plaintiff:
4	Jeff Macy
5	(Bible Translator & Director of Religious Organization 1611Bible.us)
7	
8	
9	Date: 3/13/25
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	PAGE 3
-	

PAGE 4

28